

II. REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. By this Response, Applicant provisionally elects Group I, claims 1-16, with traverse. Prompt examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

With regard to the Restriction Requirement, MPEP § 803 states:

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:


(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 802.01, § 806.04, § 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05 -§ 806.05(i)); and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a) -§ 806.04(i), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02).

Turning to the second element of MPEP § 803, Applicant submits that the Office fails to prove that a serious burden exists relative to the separation of Group I from Group II. In the Restriction Requirement, the Office does not even assert that a serious burden exists. A restriction is not warranted simply because Group I and Group II are in different subclassifications. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no serious burden relative to the separation of Group I from Group II, because a search and/or understanding of group I inherently (necessarily) involves the search and/or understanding of Group II.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement between Groups I and II. Should the Examiner require anything further from Applicant, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Spencer K. Warnick
Reg. No. 40,398

Dated: 7/26/06

(JLM)

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)